THE SIXTH DAY.

10th January 1907.

The Assembly again met at 12 noon on Thursday the 10th January 1907.

IX. Miscellaneous.

184. Abolition of Adiyara for adoption.

Mr. M. Madhavan Tampi (*Kalkulam*) represented that there had been three kinds of Adiyaras levied from Marumakkathayees in cases of adoption. The first was the levy of a succession fee calculated at one-fourth of the estimated value of the property which formed the subject of inheritance in the case of Kootukars or distant relations dying without direct heirs. This had been already abolished by the Royal Proclamation of 1063. Similarly, in the case of adopting sons and nephews, different succession fees were levied and the members prayed that these also might be abolished as they did not bring in any large revenue to Government, but pressed hard on many Marumakkathayam families and opened a wide door to corruption and fraud. He said that there was considerable delay in the enquiry as to the value of the property forming the subject of succession and, in most cases, His Highness the Maha Rajah had been graciously pleased to command the remission of the Adiyara. The Neet of adoption was a privilege which they did not wish to part with, their only prayer being the abolition of the fees, as this would do away with the present elaborate enquiries and consequent delay.

Mr. Kanakku Mathevan Mathevan (*Nedumangad*), *Mr. N. Madhavan Valiathan* (*Tiruvalla*) and *Mr. N. Kesavan Valiathan* (*Kartigapalli*) spoke in support of the request.

Mr. P. Mathevan Pillai (*Nanjanattar Sabha, Nagercoil*) prayed for the remission of Adiyara fees levied in the case of Nanjanad Vellalas adopting children as heirs and promised to submit a separate memorandum on the subject.

Mr. M. Sivathanu Pillai (*Tovala*) spoke in support.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Reply.—It is observed that there is no prayer for dispensing with the Neet of adoption. The Adiyara in such cases corresponds to the succession duty levied in other countries and is, in this instance, merely a fee for the waiver of the contingent right of escheat. As such, it is a prerogative of the Sovereign and cannot be renounced. It is true that in the case of Kootukars or collateral heirs this fee has been given up, probably on the principle that collateral heirs may succeed eventually. When strangers come in, this reason cannot, in the nature of things, be made to apply. It is admitted that such cases are few and even in most of them remission is granted by the generosity of His Highness the Maha Rajah. That the amount of collection under a certain impost is small is an argument cutting both ways. It may be given up, if not opposed to principle. It can be easily paid, if it is not heavy. In reference to difficulties mentioned in the enquiries touching the valuation of properties, all care will be taken to avoid delay and hardship.

The same reply holds good in regard to Mr. Mathevan Pillai's proposal also. If, however, any new aspects are presented in the memorandum promised by him, they will be considered.

185. That marriages should be registered.

Mr. Ponnaiya Nadar of Eraniel (*Nominated*) in whose name this subject stood was absent.

Reply.—The subject is too vague and cannot be answered.

186. Registry of marriages among Mahomedans.

Mr. Shaik Sulaiman Labba of Agastiswaram (*Nominated*) requested that arrangements might be made by Government for the proper registry of marriages among Mahomedans.

Reply.—This is a matter for the members of the Mahomedan community to arrange among themselves. But if any specific act has to be done in the matter by Government, it will be attended to, if an application is made.

187. Provision of Satroms for all classes.

Mr. Shaik Sulaiman Labba of Agastiswaram (*Nominated*) requested that a separate satrom might be constructed for the accommodation of Mahomedan and Christian wayfarers at Kottar.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly